

1

8 THERESA MORROW: [I'm a resident of Las  
9 Vegas. The last time I came to one of these hearings  
10 was several years ago. And what disturbs me very  
11 much is they haven't really changed, you know. I  
12 come here looking for information and all I see is PR  
13 really for the nuclear waste dump. It's like our DOE  
14 is a lobbying arm of the nuclear industry. And that  
15 disturbs me because the DOE I expect to work for all  
16 of us and help all of our energy needs.

17 And I expect to see information about, yeah,  
18 we use a lot of energy, we waste a lot of energy, we  
19 have energy trouble. No question. It would be nice  
20 to come to something like this and to see that, to  
21 see what is it we use, what is it we're going to  
22 need, what can we do, you know, some conservation  
23 solutions and alternative solutions.

24 I mean, what is the DOE doing for us besides  
25 supporting nuclear energy, which I don't believe is  
1 safe. I don't believe it's clean. Obviously it's  
2 false to say it's clean. It doesn't emit carbon but  
3 it's not clean because of the nuclear waste. And  
4 also I think it's very inaccurate to say it doesn't  
5 emit carbon, because, I mean, obviously the nuclear  
6 industry has to mine uranium, has to transport and do  
7 all these things, and within that process a lot of  
8 fossil fuels are used.

9 So it's just like with the issue about  
10 ethanol. You know, there's studies that say it takes

11 a lot of energy to produce ethanol so that perhaps,  
12 you know, it's not the best alternative because we're  
13 robbing from Peter to pay Paul, so to speak.

14 I'm not a scientist but I know what science  
15 is. I know science is not biased. I know there are  
16 two sides in scientific theories. I come here. I  
17 see nothing about risks, nothing about complications,  
18 nothing about science whatsoever as far as making any  
19 kind of informed decisions about what we should all  
20 be doing for the future of our energy needs, and  
21 that's what I expect to get from DOE. If I'm going  
22 to take my time to come to something that's taxpayer  
23 funded, DOE, you know, I want to get something and  
24 not just a snow job to try to convince me that  
25 nuclear energy is good.

1 I mean, and this, like I said, this is the  
2 same show. It's been, I don't know, six, five, six  
3 years. It's the same show I came to last time.  
4 Nothing has changed. I mean, from what I understand,  
5 we use five to ten percent from our grid in Las Vegas  
6 where we get our energy, five to ten percent of it  
7 comes from nuclear energy. You know, that's not a  
8 lot. I believe we could do better and we could cut  
9 that out and say if we don't use it then why should  
10 we store it. I believe it should stay where it is.

11 The other more esoteric comment I have is  
12 that I think it's dangerous to have an out of sight  
13 out of mind scenario or paradigm where we allow  
14 states that use a lot of nuclear power, have nuclear

15 plants to just say, Don't worry about the waste, you  
16 can dump it in somebody else's backyard. And then  
17 there's just, you know, it's the out of sight out of  
18 mind mentality, then nobody worries because it's not  
19 going to be in their backyard.

20 I sat there and watched and listened to  
21 Christine Todd Whitman on Washington Journal one  
22 morning talking, promoting nuclear energy. And a  
23 constituent from the very own state where she was  
24 governor in New Jersey called and said, If it's so  
25 safe then why not keep it in New Jersey. And she  
1 said -- she didn't have a very good answer, except  
2 that it wasn't safe enough to keep it around the  
3 dense population of New Jersey. So if it's not safe  
4 enough to keep in her backyard, then she, you know,  
5 nobody has any business sending it to somebody else's  
6 backyard.

7 But I think aside from those, and I think we  
8 need to be honest. You know, nobody is ever going to  
9 resolve any issues with the, you know, when there  
10 isn't honest, open discussion and debate and  
11 information available. And to say that nuclear power  
12 is clean and safe and cheap I think is hard to  
13 believe.

14 And we're not really given, you know, I  
15 mean, what is the actual cost? I'm still questioning  
16 that. How cheap it is, considering the  
17 externalities. Clean? No. It doesn't emit carbon



18 but that's apples and oranges, being a non-carbon  
19 emitting source of energy and a clean source of  
20 energy. You know, there's the nuclear waste, which  
21 is not clean. It's a contaminant. There's no other  
22 way to say it except, you know, it's contaminated and  
23 that's not clean. So nuclear energy is not clean.  
24 It just doesn't emit carbon.

25           So, I mean, just those little things make it  
1 very frustrating to ever have honest and intelligent  
2 and respectful dialogue. When we come here and all  
3 it is is it's all one-sided and biased in an effort  
4 to just push this forward. And, you know, there's no  
5 information on the risks and dangers, which there's  
6 no denying that there is, but those all seem to have  
7 to come from the public. They don't get presented to  
8 us from our Department of Energy. The Department of  
9 Energy is not owned by the nuclear industry, but  
10 that's what this experience is like.

11           And I'm going to wrap it up real quick here  
12 because I guess my main point is that it would be  
13 great if our Department of Energy wanted to get on  
14 the same page with the public and start getting real  
15 and honest with the public. Yeah, we use too much  
16 energy. We waste too much energy. And there are a  
17 lot of alternatives for the future for all of us that  
18 we could come to some agreements on.

19           And those are the kind of conversations and  
20 dialogues that would be nice to be a part of, but  
21 there is nowhere that that's happened and there's

22 nowhere that that's going on and it never happens  
23 here and it's never changed from however many years  
24 ago it is, which makes it even more suspect, because  
25 due to it not being credible, as credible as it  
1 should be, as credible as we should expect it to be.

2 And I don't mean that as any disrespect to  
3 anybody at the DOE. I believe they're good,  
4 hardworking people. I'm just saying I feel  
5 disrespected. I feel, well, I just feel I guess  
6 disrespected is the best word because I'm, like I  
7 said, I'm not a scientist, but I know what scientific  
8 process is, and this is not. Science is not biased,  
9 and this processed is always biased.

10 And we're never going to solve anything by  
11 having, you know, two sides that, you know, are  
12 staunchly, you know, engrained in their positions and  
13 where we can't get together and say, well, you know,  
14 okay, you know, what other alternative can we look at  
15 to solve some of our energy needs.

16 And I go around, I'm sorry, I mean to keep  
17 wrapping up, and then I hear all the countries that  
18 use nuclear. What about all the countries that  
19 don't? What about Brazil? You know, the United  
20 States of America couldn't achieve what Brazil has  
21 achieved? I mean, that's disturbing, extremely  
22 disturbing.

23 And, I mean, I think we all should have a  
24 lot higher expectation of ourselves and our

25 government and what we're capable of doing. And I  
1 don't think nuclear energy is the best step we can do  
2 in any way, shape or form. ] So thanks a lot for  
3 giving me this opportunity.